DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 207 CG 002 699

By-Hatch, Stephen

STUDENT RESIDENCE: A DISCUSSION OF THE LITERATURE. RESEARCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION MONOGRAPH NUMBER 4.

Society for Research into Higher Education, Ltd., London (England).
Spons Agency-London Univ. (England). Inst. of Education, Dept. of Education.
Pub Date Jun 68
Note-33p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
Descriptors-*HIGHER EDUCATION, *INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT, *LITERATURE REVIEWS, *RESIDENT STUDENTS

This is a review of the literature on student residence published in Britain. The achievements of 19th century university reformers are noted. The currents of opinion which have shaped residential policy in Britain since World War II are considered. An account is given of the issues involved in current policy. A general sociological interpretation is made of the effects of residence on students. A bibliography of related material is provided. (PS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

research into higher education MONOGRAPH No. 4

ED 022207

STUDENT RESIDENCE:

A discussion of the Literature

STEPHEN HATCH

Department of Higher Education
University of London Institute of Education

CG 002 699

The SOCIETY FOR RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION is a registered charity and was set up in December 1964 to encourage and co-ordinate research into all aspects of higher education. It seeks to make research findings more widely available and to promote their more effective use.

The Society

organises conferences, study groups, seminars and other meetings at national and regional level;

holds an Annual Conference at which recent research findings are presented and discussed;

maintains a Register of research in progress;

issues a quarterly series of Abstracts of the more important literature;

reports on matters of interest and publicises its activities in a monthly Bulletin;

publishes reports and review monographs;

collects unpublished research material, thus enabling it to be made more widely available;

works in collaboration with other national bodies interested in research into higher education and seeks to establish contact with overseas organisations.

Membership of the Society is open to institutions (corporate subscription: 15 guineas per annum) and to individuals (subscription: £2 per annum).

Enquiries are welcome and should be addressed to The Secretary, Society for Research into Higher Education Ltd., 7 Woburn Square, London, WC1.

Price : 7/-

STUDENT RESIDENCE :

A DISCUSSION OF THE LITERATURE

By

Stephen Hatch

Society for Research into Higher Education Ltd.,
2 Woburn Square, London, WC1.

June 1968

ED022207

CONTENTS

	Page
Part I: PURPOSES, PREFERENCES and PROVISION	1
The Collegiate Ideal	1
New Directions	4
Outside the Universities	5
Student Preferences	6
Present Policies and Provision	8
Part II: RESIDENCE AND THE SOCIALISATION OF STUDENTS	11
The Evidence	11
Need for Explanation	13
Cohesive Institutions	14
The Plural Culture	16
Role of the Warden	19
Conclusion	21
REFERENCES	22

PREFACE

I began this monograph with the intention of producing a straightforward review of the literature on residence published in Britain since the War. It has now evolved into something more than this. In the first place, I soon decided that the post-War discussions on residential policy could not properly be understood except in the context of a brief historical account of the development of the collegiate ideal. Some comment is, therefore, made on the achievements of the university reformers of the mid-nineteenth century. This is followed by a consideration of the currents of opinion that have shaped residential policy since the War. Part I ends with an account of the issues involved in current policy.

The second major departure from a simple review of the literature is embodied in Part II. This consists of a discussion of the effects of residence on students. I came to the conclusion that the existing evidence on the subject was fragmentary and sometimes impressionistic. Merely to summarise it as it stood would not contribute a great deal to an understanding of the functions of residence in higher education. I have therefore attempted a more general sociological interpretation, drawing on American work where it is helpful. Even though this points more to gaps in knowledge than to firm conclusions based upon research, and may therefore be of more use to researchers than to policy makers, I hope that Part II as well as Part I will enable those who take decisions about student residence to do so in the light of a greater familiarity with what is known and what is not know on the subject.

The bibliography at the end is not meant to be exhaustive. I have attempted to include all the more substantial work published in Britain since the War. Articles that seem to me of more ephemeral interest I have not included: nor have I included work that was published in an impermanent or inaccessible form: and there may be a number of reports and surveys, particularly among those published less recently, which have escaped me. The choice of American work is highly selective. It is largely confined to material relevant to the argument in Part II: not all of this is immediately concerned with residence.

SH

PURPOSES, PREFERENCES AND PROVISION

The Collegiate Ideal

The British system of higher education is unique in the attention it gives to the accommodation of its students. Apart perhaps from systems directly inspired by the British, there can be no country which spends proportionately as much money on residence or devotes so much consideration to this issue as we do here. Why is this?

Any explanation must in part be historical, since many contemporary ideas and practices spring from a pattern of university life existing at Oxford and Cambridge in the 19th century. Thus although this survey of the literature is concerned primarily with material published since 1945, a brief reference must be made to the historical background.

The colleges at Oxford and Cambridge and the ideal of an intellectual community that they embodied had their origin in the Middle Ages. By the beginning of the 19th century the inspiration of earlier generations had sunk to a low ebb: often the colleges tended to be little more than comfortable refuges for unmarried clerics, many of them bibulous and indolent, en route to one of the college livings[31]: while undergraduates, the offspring of the aristocracy and the gentry, were more concerned with horse racing and social life than with intellectual achievement.

During the middle years of the century all this changed, and the somnolent colleges of earlier years were faced with a number of decisive challenges[62]. The Oxford Movement introduced a new moral seriousness; increasing numbers of the growing middle classes were admitted; and the movements for reform destroyed the exclusively Anglican basis of the two universities, fostered higher standards of intellectual performance and brought in new subjects, which tended to be taught at the university rather than the college level. In particular the German model of higher education, with its professors dedicated to the advancement of knowledge, forced the colleges to re-define their raison d'etre. In the process a new collegiate ideal came into being. None expressed it more eloquently than Newman[57], while its key relationship was well put by Pattison in his evidence to the Royal Commission of 1850:

> "the close action of the teacher on the pupil, of the matured character on the unformed, of the instructed on the learning mind, not indeed without a very beneficial reaction of the young on the aging man.." [62]

Though Pattison later came to favour the very different German idea of a university, these aspirations did not lose their force in Oxford, and were influential in Cambridge, in the small, new, collegiate university at Durham, and in the residential training colleges for teachers being established from 1840 onwards by the churches. In essence they involved the assumption of a strong pastoral responsibility for the development of the undergraduate's intellect and character; also a concern for his moral welfare, expressed in somewhat puritanical terms by Pusey, who wrote that "lodging houses are the worst form of temptation. It is known that persons who have escaped every other sin have fallen through the evils of lodging houses..." [31].

Such concerns were very much the opposite of the lernfreiheit of the continent, and required a commitment on the part of the dons to teaching rather than to the advancement of knowledge. The inspiration behind this was primarily Christian, and the change in Oxford and Cambridge can be seen as the counterpart of the Arnoldian revolution in the public schools. Both were explicitly aiming at the creation of a new elite out of a synthesis of the old aristocracy and the new middle classes emerging from the industrial revolution. The education of an elite meant pursuing a wide range of moral and cultural goals - in fact the education of the whole man. To do this, residence in a community was felt to be essential. Thus in England elite education was stamped with two distinctive inter-related characteristics - breadth of goals and residence.

In recent years the assumptions lying behind the residential ideal have come in for increasing questioning. Nevertheless the first statements about residence to appear after the war clearly drew much from the same Christian tradition. Both the SCM report of 1946[69] and Sir Walter Moberly's Crisis in the University[48] argued powerfully for the corporate life based on halls of residence, and a similar line was taken by Bruce Truscot[75].

Much of this thinking was clearly stimulated by the problems of the Redbrick universities in the inter-war years. These institutions were then very much commuter colleges, for a majority of their students lived at home: they did not offer students much stimulus in the way of communal activities or relations with their teachers. Too often these students were pursuing little more than passports to a professional career; and even these passports were not always of undisputed validity on account of the economic depression. By contrast at Oxford and Cambridge, to quote one of Sir Walter Moberly's purpler passages:

> "The beauty and dignity of their surroundings, the studious cloisters, the high embowed roof, the storied windows, richly dight, the pealing organ, impart an element of splendour to the quality of the common life and enhance the student's sense that he has become a citizen of no mean city".

Hence the post-war policy makers naturally put a strong emphasis on strengthening the corporate feeling of the provincial universities, in order to foster a more active student life, break down departmental barriers and create a community of staff and students. One deliberate option lay behind this: faced with criticisms of the uniquely specialised nature of the curriculum in English secondary and higher education, the accepted answer was residence rather than a broadening of the curriculum.

Halls of residence were the means towards a more general education, and one can perhaps detect Sir Walter Moberly's hand behind the endorsement they received in the UGC's 1935-47 review[80]:

> "as compared with lodgings or with many homes, a Hall affords an environment where intellectual interests are strong. It affords students exceptionally favourable opportunities for the stimulating interplay of mind with mind, for the formation of friendships, and for learning the art of understanding, and living with others of temperament and outlook different from their own. It can be, and it often is, a great humanising force."

But they were not always humanising. The SCM report suggested, for example, that in halls "too often the whole spirit of the place is against any kind of cultural or intellectual activities, apart of course from 'work'...Undeniably the whole atmosphere of these halls militates against a full student life, and the development of personality." But, in the view of the SCM, the answer to such failures lay in choosing the right kind of people as wardens and giving halls a sufficiently high status in the universities' scheme of things.

This then was the approach that lay behind the development of what is now thought of as the traditional hall of residence. It received its fullest expression in the report of the sub-committee set up by the UGC under the chairmanship of Professor W.R. Niblett[77]. This was published in 1957 and put forward a number of grounds for the building of more halls of residence. For one thing the supply of lodgings was inadequate, with severe shortages in some university towns. But more important was the general education of the student: halls played a valuable part in this by giving the student the opportunity for involvement in a community smaller than the whole university. Such a community could foster a widening of interests and friendships, stimulating contacts between staff and students and the development of social responsibility. The role of halls in the development of students' social behaviour received stronger endorsement elsewhere, in a report of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (the Murray Report)[21] which stated: "Manners, conduct and deportment are not merely frills on education; they are outward and visible signs of character and personality, and in the complex society of today qualities of personality may be as important as acquired knowledge.." Other functions of halls stressed by the Niblett Report were as antidotes to the 9-5 approach and to a narrowly departmental mentality and as a means of integrating first generation students into the university.

To achieve these objectives the Report recommended that a hall should form a community with its own ethos: thus it should not be too large (130-150 the sub-committee considered the best size), the student should spend at least two years in it, and it should be sited near the main university buildings. More than anything else the quality of the warden would determine the success of the hall. To ensure that good people were recruited wardens should ideally have virtually professorial standing, hold academic posts within the university, and be properly represented on decision making bodies. Also very important for the success of the hall was an actively involved senior common room, with if possible one member for every twenty students.

Both the Murray and Niblett Reports stated that no opinions had been expressed to them that were hostile to residence. However, one doubt about priorities in residential provision was voiced by Sir Eric Ashby in 1951[9]. He stressed the disadvantages suffered by home students and pointed out that the high cost of halls precluded a rapid increase in hall places. Consequently, he argued, it was important to do as much as possible to improve conditions for students not in hall by creating extra facilities on the campus for them, and thereby lengthening the student day. But the Niblett Report, though suggesting that some universities might experiment with student houses providing a variety of facilities for students in lodgings, felt this was very much a second best, chiefly because it provided little opportunity for fostering a corporate spirit.

New Directions

More recently there has been a definite movement of opinion away from the residential hall. A number of writers have contributed to this change. Halsey in 1961[32] argued for the concept of an academic 'latin quarter'. And in 1962 came two influential documents from the University of Leeds. One of them, known as the Grebenik Report[82], was based on a survey of Leeds students. It showed clearly that the conditions in many lodgings left a lot to be desired; and it recommended that the university should provide not just halls of residence but a variety of different forms of accommodation, particularly independent bed-sitters. This was followed by the report of a sub-committee which inspected student accommodation in Scandinavia[83], and gave the impetus to the erection of the Henry Price Building with its groups of bed-sitters leading into a common kitchen shared by about ten students. Also at this time appeared Marris' very critical assessment of the value of halls of residence[44], and the Reith lectures by Dr. Sloman[67], in which he explained why the University of Essex had abandoned the idea of halls of residence and had adopted an innovation in student residence, distinctly radical in British terms. In his view the traditional hall was no longer the best answer for a number of reasons: it was costly and catered only for a minority of students; the senior members to make a hall a success were increasingly difficult to find; most modern halls were for reasons of economy much larger than the Niblett Report recommended and hence ceased to be meaningful communities; students wanted greater independence and the way to encourage them to be responsible was not to put them in halls ("in the corridors of many a women's hall lingers the ghost of a Victorian chaperone") which would perpetuate adolescence, but to allow them to look after themselves.

The Robbins Report[22] which appeared in 1963 said it would be essential to find somewhere to live for the greatly increased number of students, and recommended that residential accommodation should be provided for two-thirds of the increased numbers in higher education. Thus, on the basis of projections which have subsequently proved to be well on the low side, it suggested that over 225,000 extra residential places would be needed by 1980. In discussing the form this accommodation should take the Committee was open minded: halls were not the best solution for all students: as far as possible the universities should aim to provide a diversity of accommodation, with the emphasis on forms of accommodation that were cheaper than the traditional hall. The exploration of alternatives to halls of residence has led to a number of new developments. At Newcastle, Edinburgh, Leeds and University College London, for example, old houses have been converted into bed-sitters, with perhaps a common kitchen. In York this kind of accommodation is being provided by an independent housing association. Other universities, notably Leeds, Manchester and Essex have provided purpose built blocks of flats. The Essex residential towers are particularly interesting for they represent an attempt to integrate resident and non-resident students, through the allocation of some of the rooms in each flat to non-residents as work rooms. Equally interesting is the student village at Fallowfield, Manchester.

Another approach to student accommodation is represented by the collegiate system. Among the new universities it is notable that only one, Warwick, has adopted what might be described as the conventional hall. Three, York, Kent and Lancaster, have chosen to build colleges. Although in these new collegiate systems

the colleges have nothing like the autonomy to be found at Oxford and Cambridge, and may therefore have difficulty in establishing an equivalent corporate identity, they do represent significant re-assertions of the educational value of the residential community, a value that may perhaps become more evident as universities in general increase in size. Illustrations and comments on a number of these more recent developments are provided by Brawne[15], Dober[23] and Donat[24], the emphasis in each being primarily architectural; while Clossick's study[20] gives a favourable sociological assessment of the Essex residential towers.

Outside the Universities

Most of the discussion of residence in higher education has been exclusively concerned with the universities. Not much has been written about residence in colleges of education or in technical colleges. In the colleges of education this may well be because, at any rate until recently, residence was generally taken for granted. For example a Ministry of Education bulletin on college hostels[46] published in 1957 contented itself with affirming that "the residential accommodation plays a great part in contributing to the character of a training college...", and then went on to define the quality of accommodation that should be provided. The colleges of education have always assumed very wide responsibilities for the general education and welfare of their students and, even nowadays, when more of their students are in lodgings, the quality of the lodgings is generally most carefully controlled. A majority of college of education students are women, and many of the colleges' traditions spring from an era when it was felt necessary to take strict precautions to preserve the moral welfare of young women. Such traditions may be disappearing, but they help to explain the historical emphasis on residence. In any case they represent only one expression of a more fundamental belief that moral and cultural education is an indispensable part of the training of a teacher, since teachers are themselves expected to transmit moral and cultural values to children. This approach is dependent upon the creation of a community: in the words of Miss J. Skinner, the present Chairman of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education:

> "Indeed the personal relationships that make the community do more than this; they are the means (and I sometimes think the only means) by which values are effectively transmitted".[66]

It is difficult to see how a community of this kind can be maintained except upon the basis of residence. However, in recent years many of the colleges have changed a great deal. It is not only a matter of rapid growth in size: with this have come a greater heterogeneity among staff and students, more formal and bureaucratic as opposed to personal methods of administration; an increase in departmentalisation, and so on. All these raise questions about both the possibility and the desirability of maintaining that form of community that has been so much a mark of the life of many colleges in the past.

Though they are now together as partners in one half of the binary system, the polytechnics and the colleges of education are in opposite positions as regards residence. The polytechnics are overwhelmingly male institutions, whose main concern has been the transmission of vocationally useful knowledge and skills: moral and cultural values have not been at the forefront. Nevertheless there has

been an increasing awareness of the need to liberalise the education of technologists. Circular No. 320 of the Ministry of Education[47], basing its arguments on the desirability of students mixing together outside the lecture room, stated that it should be the aim to allow each student in the then Colleges of Advanced Technology at least one year in residence. Three years later the book Residence and Technical Education[65] appeared. This was a report prepared under the guidance of a committee established by four organisations concerned with technical education. It began by saying how valuable a contribution residence could make to the liberalisation of technical education, and went on to recommend the provision of more halls of residence and of short term residential courses both for staff and for students. Since that report was written the CATs have become universities. Now the new polytechnics are findings themselves in a position similar to that occupied by the CATs ten years ago, and perhaps not so very different from that of the Redbrick universities in the inter-war years.

Student Preferences

So far the main concern has been with the aims of academics. What of the preferences of students? Official student opinion, as represented by the National Union of Students, has changed considerably in the last ten years. Up to that time it favoured the traditional hall, but by 1960 arguments for cheaper, more independent accommodation were coming to the fore. To begin with the main concern seems to have been simply that a greater quantity and variety of accommodation should be made available, but in a statement produced in 1964[52] the NUS was explicitly critical of the high cost of halls of residence, and recommended the building of flats and bed-sitters, which would cost less and give students more freedom. In this way more could be done to meet the urgent housing needs created by the rapid increase in student numbers, both inside and outside the universities. It went on to suggest that the provision of housing for all students should be in the hands of specially established regional bodies. More recently the NUS and a number of student unions from individual institutions have been turning their attention to the possibilities of providing student accommodation through housing associations or co-operatives.

At the time of writing the NUS is in the process of producing a further statement on student accommodation. This is likely to contain a full account of NUS policy, as well as information on current trends and developments and references to a number of statements and surveys by individual student unions, some of which were submitted to the UGC in 1966.

However the views of student leaders do not always reflect precisely the views of 'the man in the library'. There have been a number of surveys of student opinion and these perhaps give a more representative picture than statements by elected officials. All these surveys have been carried out since 1960, some by students, others by university or college authorities to help in the formation of policy. The apparent lack of earlier surveys no doubt reflects in large measure the recent origin of the current interest in social enquiry, but it seems also to indicate that in the 1950s student residence was not a highly controversial subject: there was little or none of the questioning of policies and purposes so characteristic of the 1960s.

The questions asked of students about accommodation varied somewhat and are not always exactly comparable. For this reason, and because prices, conditions and the availability of different forms of accommodation vary widely from place to place, comparisons between institutions need to be treated with caution. However a first preference for living in hall is sufficiently precise and definite for the findings on this point to be summarised. The figures in the following table all come from surveys that seem at least adequate in terms of sample size and response rate, and show clearly how wide is the variation between institutions.

Percentage of respondents (a) preferring hall or college, and (b) living in hall or college at various institutions

	(a) Preferring	(b) Living
Loughborough University 1963[76]	85	99
Loughborough College of Education 1963[76]	80	71
Exeter University 1964 (2nd)	68	81
Cambridge University 1962 (3rd)[44]	68	61
Nottingham University 1964 (2nd)	60	47
"A Northern College of Education" 1965[68]	52	71
Sheffield University 1961[85]	36	15
Southampton University 1962 (3rd)[44]	33	51
University College London 1964 (2nd)	32	36
Bath University 1962[16]	28	0
Leeds University 1961[82]	25	16

Note: (1) The date refers to the year in which the survey was carried out: the figure in brackets shows the year of the students surveyed, whenever the survey did not include the whole undergraduate population.

(2) The figures from Exeter, Nottingham and University College London are derived from a survey carried out by the author which has not yet been published.

At six institutions the proportion preferring hall was greater than the proportion living in hall and at five the opposite was the case. What is striking is the correspondence between the proportions of the various samples who were living in hall and the proportions who preferred hall. The general implication must be that students like what they know. Preferences as to other forms of accommodation were not always enquired into in these surveys and cannot be as clearly summarised. But generally it seems that the numbers of students living at home or in lodgings were larger than the numbers preferring these types of accommodation, and that there was an unsatisfied demand for independent or flat accommodation. Of the surveys mentioned above only that carried out at Sheffield gave students the chance to express a preference for a university-provided flat or bed-sitter; and a third stated that that was what they would like. An even stronger preference for flats

was found in the Battersea study[3], but its results have not been presented in a form that makes comparisons possible. There is not much statistical evidence about mixed accommodation, but both the Loughborough and Battersea studies showed that the idea was quite popular.

These findings are based mostly on answers to rather crude questions simply analysed. There has been relatively little effort to find out what it is that students like or dislike about different forms of accommodation. However, from the answers to a questionnaire sent to the students in a Sheffield hall, Warr[88] found that 'making friends from other departments', 'feeling you belong to a community' and 'talking to someone when you are fed up' were most frequently endorsed as ways in which hall was better than lodgings. A sample survey carried out recently at Belfast by two members of the academic staff[28] (again not properly comparable with those summarised in the table above) asked students about the advantages and disadvantages of the accommodation in which they lived. Those living at home rated cheapness and comfort as the main advantages, while distance from the university was the commonest disadvantage. Halls were seen as providing comfort and company, but were expensive. The independence of flats was valued most highly; against this was set the disadvantage of household duties. Lodgings seemed to have no outstanding advantages and disadvantages. Bed-sitters were valued for their convenience to the university, but on an overall measure of satisfaction came out lowest of all forms of accommodation. The most positive ratings were accorded to halls, followed closely by home and flats.

Belfast is in rather a special position in that over half of its students live at home. A similar enquiry at an English university might yield different results. Such an enquiry could be valuable, for if student preferences are to be taken seriously they should be more carefully investigated: simple aggregation of first choices is an unsophisticated procedure and can be misleading. One needs to find out which students express what preferences, and why.

Present Policies and Provision

Since the war the most considerable change in student accommodation has been the shift away from living at home. Indeed statistics on the number of students living at home must understate the decline in students living with their parents, because they also include a growing number of married students living with their spouses. Only in Scotland, where over 40% of the students live at home, has this trend not taken a powerful hold. As the table below shows, there has been a large increase in the proportion of students living in lodgings and flats, followed by a small decline. During the same period the proportion of students in university-provided accommodation has risen too, despite the rapid increase of student numbers and the inclusion in the most recent figures of the former CATs, of which all but one are far from well endowed with their own residential accommodation. This points to a considerable investment in residence during recent years. The UGC does not provide detailed summaries of the universities' capital expenditure: however in its 1959/60 Returns it anticipated that residence would account for 20% of the universities' building programmes between 1962 and 1965, a figure that would not include any residence financed from private sources.

Living Accommodation of University Students : 1938/39 to 1965/66

	College, hall or hostel	Home	Lodgings or flats	Total Students
	%	%	%	
1938/39	25	42	33	50,000
1954/55	28	29	42	81,700
1961/62	28	20	52	113,100
1965/66	33	18	48	166,728

Source: UGC Returns[78]

A similar series of figures is not available for teacher training and further education. However the Robbins survey[22] showed that in 1961/62 two thirds of the students in teacher training lived in hall or college, compared to 15% of those in the CATs and only 4% of those in other forms of advanced further education. In the CATs and further education about half the students not in hall lived at home. More recent information is available from a survey of all institutions of higher education carried out by Brothers and Kendall[17]. This makes plain the wide variation in residential provision among the institutions of any one type.

The large expenditure on residential building during the last ten years has been accompanied by a more stringent control of costs. A system of cost control was first introduced by the University Grants Committee in 1958. The Robbins Report[22] pointed out that the costs of university residential accommodation tended to be higher than comparable forms of accommodation, notably training colleges. In 1965 a revised system of cost control was introduced[79] that established a common formula for residential accommodation for all institutions of higher and further education. The basis of this system and the variety of options available to architects within the cost limits were explained in a joint publication of the Department of Education and Science and the UGC that appeared in 1967[81]. References to further publications concerning the design of student accommodation, and the standards and facilities required are to be found in the bibliographies published by the Building Research Station[18].

The capital cost of purpose built bed-sitters or flats seems to be a little less than for conventional halls[20,22], but it is not clear to what extent this saving is achieved simply by reducing the amount of communal facilities incorporated in the residential building. If in consequence extra facilities are provided centrally instead of in association with residence, little net saving may be achieved. Hitherto there has been no radical attempt to reduce the basic cost per square foot of construction in purpose built accommodation. This lends a particular interest to the project now under way at the University of Lancaster where student accommodation is being built according to the standards and methods of conventional house building.

As far as running costs are concerned flats and bed-sitters do seem to be cheaper. Twenty years ago the Murray Report[21] suggested that halls required one member of the domestic staff for every five students. Today's halls with their

self-service meals are not so generously staffed. Nevertheless, even excluding any remuneration received by wardens (which does not figure in hall accounts), wages and salaries comprise a very large part of the running costs of halls. It is by savings here that bed-sitters and flats, where students look after themselves to a greater extent, do prove more economical to run. However the costs, both capital and current, of different forms of accommodation are complex: in particular some of the overheads (e.g. administration, maintenance, rates, etc.) are difficult to disentangle. More detailed investigations are needed before universities can say with confidence what are the implications for the allocation of financial resources of different forms of accommodation.

So far this discussion of costs has been concerned with distinguishing between halls and other forms of accommodation. Hence it has ignored changes in the design of halls. Here economies of scale have been sought. These have been pursued either by building single units very much larger than the 100-150 recommended by the Niblett Report - some of the former CATs have halls housing several hundred students - or by building federal systems, such as the Bodington Hall at Leeds, which consists of a number of smaller residential units sharing common facilities for eating and recreation.

The changing emphasis in the design of halls is well brought out by a comparison of the Murray Report of 1948[21] and the recent DES/UGC guide[81]. The former wrote that "Dining, as distinct from feeding, is a social function which deserves, even demands, dignified surroundings...". In contrast the DES/UGC publication had this to say: "Dining and kitchen facilities are not necessarily required in each new scheme. The provision of new residential places should give a university or college a convenient opportunity to re-examine the capacity and degree of utilisation of its existing catering facilities." Thus in the last ten years the emphasis, both in UGC policy and in most public discussion, has shifted markedly away from a firm enunciation of the value of traditional halls to a more functional approach: the stress nowadays is not so much upon broad educational goals associated with residence but upon ways of accommodating more students for less money.

But it would be wrong to overstate the extent to which current policy represents simply a bleak utilitarianism. In fact the suggestions made by the UGC and the DES are based on a careful analysis of the needs of the individual student. What has happened is that the needs of the individual and the needs of society are being emphasised at the expense of the needs of the institution. As its functions become more diverse and its students more varied in their backgrounds and in their subsequent destinations, the university is tending to become a more open institution, imposing a less demanding cultural pattern upon the student and mediating to a lesser extent between the individual and society. Thus behind many of the developments of recent years lies the assumption that it is not the job of the university to socialise students into a specific moral and cultural order, but rather to provide a neutral background against which the student can, with his peers, work out and develop his own particular pre-occupations.

RESIDENCE AND THE SOCIALISATION OF STUDENTS

The Evidence

Much of the discussion about residence in higher education is based upon assumptions arrived at through intuition and impression rather than objective information. There is little systematic evidence about life in hall. The literature that does exist on the functioning of halls and their effects upon students falls into two groups - descriptions and studies of individual halls, and more quantitative comparative surveys of students in different forms of accommodation. The former tend to reflect rather directly the point of view of the author, and anyway are not concerned with halls in general. The latter present evidence about the frequency of different forms of behaviour, but by ignoring the characteristics of particular halls tend to abstract the individual from his social context. This failure to bring together the analysis of organisations and the survey of individuals constitutes an unfortunate methodological hiatus. But more fundamental is the paucity of any general ideas about the nature of the effect of residence upon the development of the individual. This raises the complex but central question of student socialisation. Before discussing it more fully it would be as well to examine briefly the existing empirical evidence.

Among the descriptions of individual halls pride of place must go to Lawrenson's history of St. Anselm's Hall at the University of Manchester[37]. He describes how a hall originally founded in 1907 to provide accommodation for Anglican theological students, grew into a flourishing part of the university, with its own ethos and corporate identity. Particularly interesting is the picture of the inter-war years when in adverse circumstances but under a commanding and traditional warden the hall developed a distinctive collegiate spirit. Another Manchester hall whose history has been written[70] is Dalton Hall, a Quaker foundation; and a Leeds hall with its own ethos and religious ambience is described quite briefly by Higginson[34], the then warden of Sadler Hall. Very different are the pictures of traditional halls presented by two sociologists looking back on their experience as students of life in hall: Giddens[30] suggests that the value climate of his hall was anti-academic, while Punch[59] provides a picture of the social structure and functioning of a hall with a rich if somewhat barbarous culture of its own.

But none of these writers, whether their approach is critical or favourable, would pretend that their halls were typical of the general run of halls: rather it is the special qualities of the halls in question that caused them to be described.

What then of the more quantitative investigations? These have been aimed very largely at assessing the validity of the various advantages and disadvantages claimed for different forms of accommodation. They have for example tried to find out whether and to what extent students in hall participate more in student activities, or do better academically than other students. But most of them have not got far beyond this stage. There has been little attempt (other than in the two impressionistic accounts just mentioned) to understand different residential units as social organisations with a structure and set of processes of their own (whether

official or unofficial) which exert definite influences upon the student. In effect, no one has yet really tried to show why students in hall should, for example, participate more or perform better academically.

The main educational benefits of halls are said to consist of a broadening of interests through cross faculty friendships and involvement in organised activities, closer relationships with staff and better academic performance. The evidence about these is as follows.

The effect of residence on friendships has been looked at by Thoday[72,73], Marris[43,44] and Eden[25,26]. Thoday's pioneering study at Birmingham was based on interviews with a stratified sample of 500 students. Marris' conclusions are derived from interviews with nearly one hundred third year students at each of four universities - Cambridge, Exeter, Leeds and City (Northampton CAT as it then was). At Newcastle Eden interviewed a sample of some 300 students, nearly all living at home, or in lodgings, and supplemented these with interviews with 67 home students in Liverpool. Thoday found that hall students were more likely to make cross faculty friendships but Marris' data did not confirm this when he considered arts and science students separately. On the other hand, both the Birmingham students and those questioned by Eden did seem to think that halls were good places for getting to know students from other faculties; a finding supported also by Warr's survey[88].

The evidence about residence and participation in activities is more conclusive. The most authoritative source of information is the large follow-up survey of students who entered every university in Britain in 1955, which was carried out under the direction of Professor D.V. Glass: in 1958 one in two of these students from working class homes and one in five of the ones from middle class homes were asked, inter alia, about their experiences of university life. The data concerning participation in activities have been analysed by Acland and Hatch[4], who showed a distinctly higher level of participation among hall students. At Birmingham, Thoday indicated that hall students not only took more part in organised activities but also had a wider range of interests. The only exception is Marris' evidence from Cambridge, where every student is a member of a college: whether the Cambridge students were in residence in college or not, they seemed to have a higher level of participation than he found even among hall students at Leeds and Southampton. None of the surveys showed much difference between home and lodgings students in their level of participation in university activities; though Eden, who was specially concerned with home students, indicated that while home and lodgings students participated about equally in university activities, the home students took part in home centred activities as well, for which the lodgings students had no counterpart.

The amount of contact with staff seems to be more affected by the nature of the institution as a whole than by a student's residence. Thus Marris showed that contacts were much more frequent at Cambridge than at Leeds or Southampton. An enquiry into staff/student relations at Manchester[42], carried out by members of the academic staff and based on questionnaires from a sample of 500 students, enquired into the frequency of 'informal contacts' with members of staff. It emerged that hall students had more frequent contacts than those not in hall, but that the difference between honours and general degree students was greater.

But as with all quantitative indices, one needs to know more about the significance of what is being measured. An American study briefly reported by Wilson[55] casts a sceptical light on the effect on students of interaction with staff. For experimental purposes one of the courses at Antioch College was taught in different ways, the main variable being quantity and closeness of contact with staff. On evaluation it was found that contact did not affect the extent to which the objectives of the course were achieved. Thus one needs to examine the nature of the interactions between staff and students, as well as their quantity.

There are two sources of information about the relationship between academic performance and residence. Marris reported fewer good results and fewer bad results among hall students, i.e. a tendency for average performance, but his sample was small. The survey of 1955 entrants was far larger and thus more authoritative: both the analysis of it by Newfield[56] and the more detailed re-analysis by Acland and Hatch[4] showed no substantial differences between the three main forms of accommodation.

Need for explanation

But, except for a few hypotheses advanced rather briefly and tentatively by Acland and Hatch, none of these analyses gave a systematic explanation of how or why halls of residence might exert an influence on their members, nor did they take into account the characteristics of particular halls or the variety of ways in which different types of students might respond to given environments. Chester[19] has recently produced a valuable discussion of student socialisation, and this is relevant at many points to residence. And Albrow[7], in discussing the results of his study of a matched sample of 64 Reading hall and lodgings students, did advance a possible explanation for the differences between his two groups. These differences concerned various forms of behaviour: lodgings students went to the cinema more often and took more part in organised sport than hall students; whereas hall students read more non-fiction books, more frequently had conversations on academic subjects, spent longer on private study, more often entertained members of the opposite sex in their room, and were more likely to have discussed plans for the vacation. Albrow suggests that these provide evidence for the existence of a hall culture distinct from the wider youth culture. But his discussion suffers from the methodological hiatus mentioned earlier, in that he does not relate the differences to any feature of the social structure of halls. In the absence of such evidence one cannot decide whether the differences arise from participation in a culture specific to halls, or simply to the more intensive interaction with peers made possible by membership of a hall. The distinction is important for the latter implies only a general student culture.

Much more research on higher education has been carried out in the USA than in Britain, but there much of it seems to have been done by social psychologists; thus the findings reported for example in The American College[63] reflect the social psychologists' pre-occupation with small groups, but offer little in the way of a general theoretical framework capable of knitting together the numerous variables involved in student socialisation; and in particular skip lightly over the social structure within which the groups have their being. But in recent years there have been considerable advances in organisational theory and in the sociology of education. These now make it possible to point towards some of the more relevant theoretical considerations.

The primary difference between students in a hall or college and those who are not concerns the scope of higher education. By virtue of its residential nature a hall is high in scope - that is to say the student takes part in a large number of activities on the basis of his membership of hall. There are of course variations between individuals in any one hall in the extent to which they are hall-centred in the pattern of their activities and friendships. And halls themselves vary: some provide all a student's meals and offer many opportunities for participation in hall-based extra-curricular activities such as sport: in others the taking of meals may be optional and there may be no organised activities specific to the hall. Highest in scope are collegiate institutions where teaching is combined with residence.

The scope of a hall is likely to be much influenced by university policy. If the university gives a high priority to the fostering of corporate residential life it is likely to allocate a relatively large number of facilities and functions to halls. Another determinant of scope is the physical situation of a hall: the more isolated it is the more one would expect its members to be hall-centred.

Cohesive institutions

But what follows from high scope? Quite different patterns of socialisation may develop, and in order to understand the ways in which higher education may influence students it is important to distinguish them. The distinction is based on the presence or absence of different forms of cohesion. Etzioni[27] defines cohesion as "a positive expressive relationship between two or more actors", and distinguishes three forms of cohesion - group, rank and hierarchical. Group cohesion means the kind of cohesion that exists between groups of friends, and is likely to be found in any organisation high in scope, though the organisation may influence in a variety of ways the basis upon which groups are formed. Rank cohesion means cohesion between all those of one rank, i.e. in the present context cohesion between all the students in a hall. In more colloquial terms a hall which has rank cohesion is one where there is 'hall spirit', or a 'distinctive ethos' or a 'sense of community'. Hierarchical cohesion means cohesion between those of different ranks, or in the present context cohesion between warden and students. Hierarchical cohesion may or may not co-exist with rank cohesion.

Before discussing the relevance of rank cohesion it may be useful to consider what determines the amount of it. Leaving home to attend university is likely to involve students in a sudden transition from a secure and somewhat dependent environment to one in which they stand on their own. Consequently many students look for an alternative sense of identity and security, and it seems that involvement in corporate life or 'hall spirit' is one way of satisfying this need. There is therefore a natural tendency towards a degree of rank cohesion.

Nevertheless one would suspect that nowadays only a minority of halls of residence, though perhaps a majority of colleges of education, have a high degree of rank cohesion; and that such institutions are becoming less numerous. The reason for this lies in the erosion of certain factors that make for rank cohesion. For one thing students now tend to demand more independence and to have achieved a higher level of independence before they leave home, and thus to have less need of a corporate identity.

Another factor affecting the amount of rank cohesion is the homogeneity of the members of a hall. It is likely that cohesion will be increased by homogeneity of membership, for in halls with many nonconforming minorities few members will develop positive feelings towards all members of hall. Clearly recruitment is all-important here. Acland and Hatch[4] have shown that students entering halls of residence tend to be relatively middle class and Protestant: conversely Jewish, Catholic and working class students are over-represented among those not in hall. But this information refers to a ten-year old national sample, and there is no evidence at the level of individual halls. Often wardens aim at a 'good mix' of students, and universities seem increasingly to be laying this down as a goal of selection policy. But a choice of students that is representative in terms of easily definable characteristics such as subject of study and father's occupation, may yet be unrepresentative in respect of orientations of considerable significance for the aims and conduct of a hall, for example attitude to sport or to religion. Nevertheless the increasing size of universities and of halls is making deliberate selection more and more difficult. Nowadays it is likely to be based on the UCCA form, which is a rather impersonal document not designed for the choice of students by wardens, rather than on personal interviews. Hence it is difficult for wardens to select those with the less tangible qualities they want, and to reject those unlikely to fit in. On the other hand wardens can still generally make discriminating choices as to which students shall stay in hall for more than one year.

Two other factors closely related to rank cohesion are size of hall and length of membership. Small numbers and long membership are likely to create much stronger bonds between members. In both these respects university policies, which for reasons of economy favour large halls and for reasons of equity the recruitment of more students for shorter periods, are working against cohesive halls.

Besides such external factors, there are several aspects of the internal organisation of halls and colleges which can reflect and enhance rank cohesion. One of these is the way in which freshmen are introduced and assimilated into a hall or college. In one or two men's halls this still seems to take the form of an initiation ceremony in which the new member undergoes some sort of ordeal before a gathering of existing members. More common, especially in colleges of education, is a system of individual sponsorship of new members by older members. Like other traditions, ceremonies and collective occasions (the most obvious being formal dinners), these have the function of binding the members together and of strengthening the importance of membership, or, to use Etzioni's term, of increasing its saliency.

But what is the significance of rank cohesion for the socialisation of students? In a cohesive hall a student is embedded in a culture that carries a variety of norms and values, which relate not only to life and conduct in hall, but probably also to the individual's role in the wider university and outside world. Though of course such cultures are not monolithic in the sense that they extract conformity on every norm, there will be pressures to conform and indeed the individual will not wish to transgress the norms on account of the positive feelings he has for the other members of hall, both as individuals and as a collective entity. The result may be simply that he assents to their norms rather than internalising them in a deep and persisting manner; though this may be less likely if membership of the hall is highly salient.

In a situation where such rank cohesion is lacking, whether in a hall or among non-resident students, the student will find himself in a more plural culture, a culture which holds relatively few norms in common. Whether it is a matter of attitudes to work and study, to religion, to politics, to sex or to dress the student in the plural culture is likely to find others who share his own point of view and with whom he can consort.

In practice these two alternative patterns of socialisation do not occur in their pure form. The actual options are not of course between choice and no choice, but between more choice and less choice. Nevertheless the presentation of these two ideal types may help to clarify some of the arguments about residence and the policies universities adopt towards their students. That based on the cohesive institution will clearly appeal to those who believe that institutions of higher education should pursue specific goals that touch on many areas of life; who likewise believe that there are a definite range of norms and values that an institution should promote or that the university educated man should adhere to. But whereas in the past the task of the university was fairly well known and limited in range, nowadays its functions are more and more diversified. As an entity it is larger, while staff and students are each more varied in their social origins and in their weltanschauungen. This makes it difficult to socialise university students into a specific moral and cultural order.

The situation, however, is rather different in institutions preparing students for one particular occupation: in these a high level of cohesion may be more easily maintained. Thus colleges of education may have a confident idea of the qualities of a good teacher and aim to promote these in their students. This may also apply to some extent to medical education. And there is a similar element of socialisation towards specific ends in institutions that have traditionally aimed to give an elite education, such as the public schools and, more so in the past, Oxford and Cambridge. But this form of socialisation is to be found in other institutions besides those preparing students for a specific occupational role. It is also associated with institutions that aim to promote a specific set of values. Bennington college as described by Newcomb[53,54] evidently had a considerable degree of cohesion, and comparable patterns of socialisation could perhaps be found in many of the American denominational colleges, though of course the actual goals of such institutions must mostly be very different from Bennington's.

The Plural Culture

The situation in a plural culture is complex and the effect of it on students is difficult to delineate. The student comes to university generally in an impressionable state, eager to define his identity and to establish satisfying social relations. In a cohesive institution the approved answer to many of his needs and demands will be relatively clear and unambiguous. On the other hand, without such cohesion, a variety of alternatives will be available between which the student will be able to choose. In these circumstances it may seem that the institution can have no effect on the student, for will his choices not simply reflect and enhance the characteristics with which he arrived at the institution? But, however plural the culture, the environment is still likely to face the student with certain pressures and incentives. It is the working of these pressures and incentives that constitutes the problem of socialisation in a plural culture - a subject to which rather little attention, either

empirical or theoretical, has hitherto been devoted. This monograph is not the place to fill such gaps. But it is clearly necessary to touch on some of the factors that are relevant.

A special case of socialisation, the working class student who becomes committed to science, has recently been discussed by Box and Ford[14]: though not at all concerned with residence, it illustrates some of the considerations involved. While Merton[45] in his discussion of reference groups provides an important theoretical analysis of the general problem, and Newcomb[53] an empirical account, of how individuals are influenced by others.

In discussing the problem one needs first to ask how norms are presented to students, and then how this is affected by residence. Sometimes norms are presented in a disembodied form, i.e. as written regulations or advice or as intellectual propositions and so on. But in most cases norms of behaviour are embodied in groups or individuals. Indeed it is difficult if not impossible for an individual to adhere to norms or hold to values except in the context of and with the support of other individuals. One must therefore ask what points of reference are provided for the student by his environment. Among these points of reference the student's own friends are likely to be particularly important, but he may also be influenced by groups of which he is not a member, either from inside or outside the university, or by individuals, including members of the academic staff, who may act as 'role models'.

By its effect on the scope of higher education, discussed earlier, residence makes it more likely that the student associates with other students, and so joins groups and is exposed to role models, drawn from inside rather than outside the university. In other words residence increases group, if not rank, cohesion. Of course the effect of the university is not necessarily augmented: there may be countervailing influences. Thus for the student whose mind is already set on a particular profession, the members of that profession may well constitute an important reference group, so that he is relatively immune to the influences of his university environment. There are a number of other ways in which residence may have an effect: in influencing the basis and type of friendship groups (cf. Thoday's evidence[72] on cross faculty friendships); in presenting the student with a greater or lesser variety of role models from among his peers or the staff; and in presenting the member of staff not just as a teacher but also perhaps in social and, if he is married, in family situations. And in different contexts different individuals or groups may appear in a more or a less prestigious and attractive light: for instance, a group may achieve a certain status through the association with it of members of staff, and the form and quantity of such associations may be affected by residence. Another kind of influence in a plural culture springs from the roles the student is himself expected to play: for example, in a hall a student may have to relate to servants and to academic staff in both formal ('social training') and informal situations; while the role of housekeeper is one a student may play in a flat but not in a hall.

These then, in sketchy outline, are some of the issues which require further attention. But before leaving the topic of the plural culture, it is worth looking a little more closely at one particular facet of it - the relationship between architecture (meaning by this the physical configuration of rooms and spaces and not aesthetic qualities) and the formation of friendship groups.

Architects sometimes express disappointment with the small amount of help they get from sociologists when designing university buildings. One suspects that part of this disappointment may arise from an exaggerated view of the possible effect of physical design on the behaviour of individuals and groups. To a certain extent sociologists cannot and do not help because different designs do not have different consequences for social life. For example, Warr[88] indicates that the inhabitants of rooms arranged on a staircase in a Sheffield hall did not have significantly more or less interaction with each other than the inhabitants of rooms arranged along a corridor.

Nevertheless, some of the findings of research into spatial ecology and small groups do have a bearing on the design of student residence, even if the implications are unspectacular. A well-known study is that by Festinger, Schachter and Back[29]. In their analysis of friendship patterns on a post-war estate for married students at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology they showed that the likelihood of two people becoming friends was influenced by two factors: physical distance and functional distance. By the latter they meant simply the chance of coming into contact with someone through the arrangement of passages, houses, etc.; so the two factors might have been summarised as frequency of interaction. However the cohesiveness of groups formed in this way, and the extent to which the group influenced its individual members (which was a function of cohesiveness) seemed to be determined by factors other than spatial ecology. Another study by Loomis and Beegle[39], which describes the evolution of cliques on a rural settlement scheme, took the time factor into account: it showed that while distance was important to begin with, common interests gradually became more important.

The effect of distance on the formation of, at any rate, initial friendships means that the grouping of rooms can influence the pattern of interaction in a hall. The role of groupings based on room location can be maximised by arranging rooms in self-contained sets sharing common facilities such as a kitchen. Alternatively, rooms can be arranged in large open sets or corridors with few if any common facilities allocated to specific rooms, but instead facilities and spaces provided for use in common by a large number of people. The former intensifies interaction within a small group, which can be selected by wardens, and can thus be used to foster the growth of friendship groups that cut across factors extraneous to the residential unit, such as social background or subject of study. The latter is likely to produce more diffuse interaction between a larger number of people, giving a wider choice of friends, but also increasing the possibility of individuals remaining isolated. Wider choice of friends permits greater differentiation between friendship groups and thus a greater diversity of points of reference for the student. Though this is of course but a particular case of the commonplace truth that large size promotes specialisation and differentiation, while small size promotes integration, it indicates how even in a plural culture the influences to which the student is subjected may be affected by university policy.

In deciding its policies on residence a university is not of course faced with a simple alternative between integration and differentiation: it has to consider in what respects it want differentiation, and in what respects it want integration. Though the conclusions that follow are often of a common sense nature, one suspects that not infrequently there is a failure to formulate clearly what are the goals of residential policy and then to translate these into bricks and mortar.

A special case of integration is presented in Clossick's study of the first residential tower at the University of Essex[20]. One of the objectives of the tower was to integrate students living in the tower with those in lodgings. Each of the flats into which the tower is divided contains bedsitters occupied by one student each, and work rooms shared by four non-resident students. Each flat has a common kitchen. Clossick found that the more a kitchen was used by residents, the less it was used by non-residents. The nature of the enquiry (which did not use sociometric techniques) prevented her from following up this finding. Was it just a consequence of the capacity of the kitchen, i.e. did heavy use by residents mean it was too full for the non-residents? Or did the formation of a cohesive group of residents mean that non-residents were excluded from group membership? Contemporary thinking about student residence places increasing emphasis on its role in the formation of friendship groups among students, while the role of the larger institution capable of promoting rank cohesion and a corporate identity recedes into the background. In this situation more knowledge about the functioning of groups in residential settings would be valuable, particularly where, as at the University of Essex, a novel and important role is expected of the group.

Role of the Warden

This discussion of socialisation has so far ignored one potentially important factor - the role of the warden and other members of the academic staff. As indicated in the earlier part of this monograph, those who have argued the case for halls of residence have emphasised that the success of halls depends to a very large extent upon the warden. What has been written on the subject, for example by Murray[49] and MacFarlane[40] and in the Niblett Report[77] is largely prescriptive in nature. However, the accounts of individual halls referred to above illustrate contrasting interpretations of the warden's role. In the halls mentioned earlier that were described by senior members, the hall appears to have been dominated by the warden: it was he who in a variety of ways seemed to be the prime agent in maintaining and establishing the norms of the hall. In the other two halls the warden was apparently a rather shadowy ceremonial figure and the norms seem to have sprung from the students themselves, and to have been enforced by sanctions imposed formally or informally by the students. Much of the apparent difference may be due to the point of view from which the halls were described, but in the latter it does appear that the predominance of a cohesive student generated culture produced results antithetical to what many people would regard as the proper aims of a university education.

Some idea of the conditions in which staff may exert strong influence can be gained from a different though comparable type of institution. Thus Lambert[36] has suggested that one of the keys to the powerful influence of some public schools on their pupils is "the interpenetration of formal and informal systems" - meaning by this not simply 'good' relations between pupils and staff, but a complex set of relationships which prevents the informal life of the pupils insulating itself from the official activities of the school, and instead subtly modifies it and orientates it towards the goals of the school through a network of personal contacts, contacts in which housemasters and prefects play a particularly crucial part.

The working of such arrangements would appear to require three things:

rank cohesion, hierarchical cohesion and a powerful commitment on the part of the staff involved. Rank and hierarchical cohesion do not necessarily co-exist, but as implied above, rank cohesion in the absence of hierarchical cohesion may produce a student or pupil culture indifferent or hostile to the goals of the institution, exhibited for example in some manifestations of hall spirit. Thus rank cohesion is not necessarily relevant to the achievement of educational goals. Its significance arises from the fact that it gives rise to a common culture and thereby makes any response to the staff, whether positive or negative, and hence the influence of the staff, more uniform and pervasive than in a plural culture.

This leaves hierarchical cohesion and staff commitment as the main determinants of staff influence. In halls of residence their presence will of course depend to some extent on the personality of the warden, but it would be a mistake to see the question just as one of individual personality, for there are difficulties inherent in the position of warden within the university. He is expected to play a variety of roles, not all of which are in harmony or compatible with each other. By analysing these it may be possible to achieve a better understanding of the possibilities and limitations which confront any warden.

One form of role-conflict arises from the fact that individuals who take up wardenships also occupy other quite distinct roles. Not only do most wardens teach, they also do research, and it is often difficult for an individual to find sufficient time for each of these activities. Success in the academic world is much, perhaps increasingly, dependent upon achievement in research, and owes little to good performance as a warden. Hence many academics may be reluctant to become wardens, or once having become wardens, reluctant to become highly committed to their job as warden. This leads to problems of recruitment, particularly among women. An alternative is to recruit as wardens people who take on much of the administrative work connected with halls of residence and thus spend all or mo of their time on their duties as warden. But such people are not likely to be accorded very high status in the academic community, and suffer from being out of touch with a central part of university life.

A different form of role-conflict arises not from the other roles played by the individual warden, but from the diverse expectations that different people have of the warden, qua warden. Thus university authorities, local citizens and parents may expect the warden to be a guardian or law, order and morality. The university finance officer will expect him to run the hall economically, and to make the hall available for conferences for long periods. While students will want none of these things, but may instead expect him to support various expressions of hall spirit. And some may hope to find in him a sympathetic father figure. Again the idealistic warden may himself want to emphasise the broader educational and pastoral aspects of his role.

Some of these expectations are clearly incongruent, and whether they do it consciously or unconsciously, wardens are bound to arrive at some compromise between them. But, and this is where the personality factor comes in, different wardens will arrive at different modus vivendi. As the type of modus vivendi adopted by wardens is undoubtedly of significance for the socialising function of halls, the different choices open to wardens need some discussion. One choice is in effect to opt out, to allow students to run their hall with just enough intervention to ensure

compliance with the minimal demands of the university authorities - in terms of law and order. Thus a possible response to role conflicts is to withdraw from them. Another possible answer is for different roles to be played, not by the same individual, but by different individuals, so separating the roles entirely. The provision of specialist counselling services, which potentially reduces the pastoral role of wardens, represents a move in this direction. Alternatively a warden can emphasise the formal aspects of his position, enforcing regulations strictly, imposing when necessary the penalties that lie within his power, and in personal relations with students maintaining dignity and social distance and expecting deference. The opposite of this is the approach which relies heavily on close personal relations, pursuing friendliness and informality and depending on personal influence instead of formal sanctions. For the warden the risk of the latter approach lies in becoming so much 'one of the lads' that he loses respect, or becomes reluctant to exert any control for fear of weakening the cohesion that exists between him and his students. The former position has equal risks, in that in the absence of cohesion the life of the students may become insulated from the warden and his influence be limited to the exaction of a reluctant observance of certain formalities. One suspects that the most influential warden will be the one who maintains cohesion while retaining some of the authority that resides in his formal position. But there is no evidence to show whether this is in fact the case, or about the circumstances which may prevent or facilitate the adoption of such a role. Successful performance of such a role is likely to be exacting, and may require a considerable commitment from the individual. In considering the educational potentialities of different forms of student accommodation, and particularly in assessing the feasibility of those requiring the participation of teaching staff, one must consequently ask what degree of commitment academics are prepared to make, and how the type of residence and the wider university environment will affect this.

Conclusion

Research in higher education is still in its relatively early stages, and in this country has not yet extended far beyond the descriptive survey into a more penetrating analysis of the functioning of institutions. Hence it is not surprising if this review has left many questions unanswered. Some of these questions are important ones and extend well beyond the problems of residence alone.

One response to the feeling that the highly cohesive residential institution and the ideals associated with it are no longer as viable as they once were, is to say simply that students should be granted greater freedom. But this begs certain questions, for it is a liberal fallacy to suggest that the individual pursues his own destiny somehow unaffected by the possibilities and constraints presented by his environment. Particularly at a time of unrest among students it is desirable to examine the ends towards which students are being socialised and to understand the processes whereby this takes place.

REFERENCES

1. ABBOTT, J. Students' social class in three northern universities, British Journal of Sociology, XVI (3), 1965.

2. ABBOTT, J. The expansion of educational opportunity and the changing role of the student. Social and Economic Administration, 1(3), 1967.

3. ABEL, R.A. Student Residence Study. University of Surrey, 1966, 110 pp.

4. ACLAND, H. and HATCH, S. Three Aspects of Student Residence. Department of Higher Education, University of London Institute of Education, 1968, 14 pp.

5. ADAMS, J.W.L. Halls of residence. Universities Quarterly, 2(3), 1948.

6. ADAMS, J.W.L. John Murray on halls - a comment. Universities Quarterly, 3(4), 1949.

7. ALBROW, M.C. The influence of accommodation upon 64 Reading University students. British Journal of Sociology, XVII (4), 1966.

8. ALLEN, P.G. and MILLER, A. Living Accommodation for Young People. Building Research Station, Miscellaneous Papers No. 12, 1967, 12 pp.

9. ASHBY, E. A note on the alternative to halls of residence. Universities Quarterly, 5(2), 1951.

10. ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES OF THE COMMONWEALTH. Report of Proceedings of Ninth Congress. London, 1963.

11. ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES OF THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH. Report of Proceedings of the Home Universities Conference. 1952, pp.11-38 and 1957, pp. 13-40.

12. THE AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITY, 3(2), 1965. (Issue devoted to residence)

13. BIBBY, C. Residence in Redbrick. Universities Quarterly, 7(2), 1952.

14. BOX, S. and FORD, J. Commitment to science : a solution to student marginality. Sociology, 1(3), 1967.

15. BRAWNE, M. (ed.) University Planning and Design. Architectural Association Paper, No. 3. Lund Humphries, 1967, 126 pp.

16. BRISTOL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY (now University of Bath) Student Survey, 1962, 23 pp.

17. BROTHERS, J. and KENDALL, M. Student Residence : Policies, Provision and Regulations. Department of Higher Education, University of London Institute of Education, 1967, 19 pp.

18. BUILDING RESEARCH STATION. Living Accommodation for Young People. Library Bibliography No. 196, May 1966, 8 pp. Supplement No. 1, September 1967, 22 pp. No. 197, September 1966, 18 pp.

19. CHESTER, R. Towards a Satisfactory Way of Academic Life. SCM Press, 1968, 48 pp.

20. CLOSSICK, M. Student Residence : A new approach at the University of Essex. Society for Research into Higher Education, Monograph No. 3, 1967, 63 pp.

21. COMMITTEE OF VICE-CHANCELLORS AND PRINCIPALS. The Planning of University Halls of Residence (Murray Report). Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1948, 88 pp.

22. COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION. Higher Education (Robbins Report). Report Chapter XIII and Appendix Two (A), Part V.

23. DOBER, R. The New Campus in Britain. Educational Facilities Laboratory, New York, 1965, 71 pp.

24. DONAT, J. Living in universities. Architectural Design, XXXVI (12), 1966.

25. EDEN, A. An Enquiry into the Living and Working Conditions of Undergraduates in a Provincial University. Unpublished manuscript, 151 pp.

26. EDEN, A. Social life in a provincial university. British Journal of Sociology, X (4), 1959.

27. ETZIONI, A. Complex Organisations. The Free Press, New York, 1961, 366 pp.

28. EWART, R.W. and WILSON, D.H. Student Opinion on Accommodation. University of Belfast, 1967, 63 pp.

29. FESTINGER, L., SCHACHTER, S. and BACK, K. Social Pressures in Informal Groups. Tavistock Publications, 1959, 197 pp.

30. GIDDENS, A. Aspects of the social structure of a university hall of residence. Sociological Review, No. 8, 1960.

31. GREEN, V.H.H. Oxford Common Room : a study of Lincoln College and Mark Pattison. Edward Arnold, 1957, 336 pp.

32. HALSEY, A.H. University expansion and the collegiate ideal. Universities Quarterly, 16(1), 1961.

33. HATCH, S. Home, hall, digs, flat? Where?, Supplement 7, February 1967.

34. HIGGINSON, J.H. Creating a community. Times Educational Supplement, 15 June 1956.

35. JENCKS, C. and RIESMAN, D. Patterns of residential education : a case study of Harvard, in SANFORD, N. (ed.) The American College. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962.

36. LAMBERT, R. Introduction to Kalton G., The Public Schools, Longmans, London, 1966.

37. LAWRENSON, T.E. Hall of Residence. Manchester University Press, 1957, 146 pp.

38. LINSTEAD, P., BARNARD, G.A. and McCREATH, M. 1800 students of science and technology : a survey of the Imperial College. Universities Quarterly, 16 (1), 1961.

39. LOOMIS, C.P. and BEEGLE, J.A. Rural Social Systems. Prentice Hall, 1950.

40. McFARLANE, H.S.N. Staff-student relations - universities and halls of residence. British Universities Annual, 1962.

41. MANN, P.H. and MILLS, G. Living and learning at Redbrick : a sample survey at Sheffield University. Universities Quarterly, 16(1), 1961.

42. MARKS, M., SMITH, C.S. and WRIGHT, M. Staff-Student Relations in the University of Manchester. University of Manchester, 1962, 39 pp.

43. MARRIS, P. Halls or digs for students? New Society, No. 33, May 1963.

44. MARRIS, P. The Experience of Higher Education. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964, 220 pp.

45. MERTON, R.K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois, 1957, 645 pp.

46. MINISTRY OF EDUCATION. Training college hostels. Building Bulletin, No. 15, 1957.

47. MINISTRY OF EDUCATION. Hostels at technical colleges. Circular 320, 1957, 6 pp.

48. MOBERLY, W. Crisis in the Universities. SCM Press, London, 1949, 316 pp.

49. MURRAY, J. Halls of residence in universities. Universities Quarterly, 3(2), 1949.

50. MURRAY, J. Residence and alternatives. Universities Quarterly, 5(4), 1951.

51. NASATIR, D. A contextual analysis of academic failure. School Review, 71(3), 1963.

52. NATIONAL UNION OF STUDENTS. Report on Student Housing, 1964, 20 pp.

53. NEWCOMB, T.M. Personality and Social Change : Attitude Formation in a Student Community. Dryden, New York, 1943, reprinted 1957, 225 pp.

54. NEWCOMB, T.M., KOENIG, K.E., FLACKS, R. and WARWICK, D.P. Persistence and Change. John Wiley, 1967, 292 pp.

55. NEWCOMB, T.M. and WILSON, E.K. (eds.) College Peer Groups. Aldine, Chicago, 1966, 303 pp.

56. NEWFIELD, J.G.H. The academic performance of British university students. Sociological Review, Monograph No. 7, 1963.

57. NEWMAN, J.H. The Idea of a University. Longmans, London, 1962, 521 pp.

58. NIBLETT, W.R. Halls of residence. Times Educational Supplement, December 12 1958.

59. PUNCH, M. The student ritual. New Society, 7 December 1967.

60. RIKER, H.C. Planning Functional Housing. Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1956, 240 pp.

61. RIKER, H.C. College Students Live Here : a study of college housing. Educational Facilities Laboratories, New York, 1961, 152 pp.

62. ROTHBLATT, S. The Revolution of the Dons. Faber & Faber, 1968, 319pp.

63. SANFORD, N. (ed.) The American College. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962, 1084 pp. See especially Parts IV and VI.

64. SELVIN, H.C. The impact of university experiences on occupational plans. School Review, Autumn 1963.

65. SILBERTSON, D. Residence and Technical Education. National Institute of Adult Education - Report of a Joint Committee. Max Parrish, London, 1960, 15 pp.

66. SKINNER, J.E. College and community. Education for Teaching, Spring 1968.

67. SLOMAN, A. A University in the Making. BBC, 1964, 90 pp.

68. SOCIETY FOR RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION. Student Residence. Report of a Conference held December 1965, 48 pp.

69. STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT. Halls of residence in modern universities - a group report. University Pamphlet No. 12, SCM Press, 1946, 24 pp.

70. SUTHERLAND, G.A. Dalton Hall : a Quaker Venture. Bannisdale Press, London, 1963, 112 pp.

71. TAYLOR, W. Student culture and residence. Universities Quarterly, 19(4), 1965.

72. THODAY, D.O. Halls of residence. Universities Quarterly, 12(1), 1957.

73. THODAY, D.O. Residence and education in civic universities. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, IV(3), 1958.

74. TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT. Special feature on University Residence. 21 June 1963.

75. TRUSCOT, B. Red Brick University. Penguin Books, 1951, 375 pp.

76. UNION OF LOUGHBOROUGH COLLEGES Student Survey, 1964, 65 pp.

77. UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE. Report of the Sub-Committee on Halls of Residence (Niblett Report). HMSO, 1957, 54 pp.

78. UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE. Annual Returns.

79. UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE. Non-Recurrent Grants : notes on procedure. HMSO, 1965, 63 pp.

80. UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE. Reviews of University Development, 1935-47, 1947-52.

81. UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE and DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. Student Residence. HMSO, 1967, 40 pp.

82. UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS. Report of a Committee on Student Accommodation. 1962, 140 pp.

83. UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS. Confidential Report to the House and Estates Committee by the Delegation sent to Study Student Housing in Certain Continental Universities. July 1962, 39 pp.

84. UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM UNION. Student Social Survey. 1962, 32 pp.

85. UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD UNION OF STUDENTS. Survey 1961, 17 pp.

86. UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD UNION OF STUDENTS. Memorandum to the University Grants Committee. 1961, 9 pp.

87. VREELAND, R. and BIDWELL, C. Organisational effects on student attitudes : a study of the Harvard House. Sociology of Education, 38(3), 1965.

88. WARR, P.B. Attitudes and behaviour in a hall of residence. Universities Quarterly, 19(1), 1964.

Society for Research into Higher Education

PUBLICATIONS

1. REGISTER OF RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION

(A loose-leaf volume giving details of more than 460 on-going and recently completed research projects. Annual index and regular supplements)

Annual subscription : £2 (including binder)

2. RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION ABSTRACTS

(A quarterly publication providing abstracts of the more important literature in almost 200 journals)

Annual subscription : £3 (Vol. 2) . copies of Vol. 1, Nos. 3 & 4 only are available at 10/- each

3. RESEARCH INTO HIGHER EDUCATION MONOGRAPHS

No. 1 - "Examinations and Higher Education : a survey of the literature" by Roy Cox OUT OF PRINT

No. 2 - "Research into Teaching Methods in Higher Education" by Ruth Beard (56pp., 9" x 6", October 1967) Price: 12/6

No. 3 - "Student Residence - a new approach at the University of Essex" by Maris Glossick (72pp., 9" x 6", December 1967) Price: 17/6

4. OCCASIONAL PUBLICATIONS

No. 1 - "Student Residence" - proceedings of a conference organised by the Society in 1965" OUT OF PRINT

No. 2 - "Educational Research in Colleges of Education" - papers presented at a conference in March 1967 (48pp., 9" x 6", June 1967) Price: 10/6

No. 3 - "Research into Library Services in Higher Education" - papers presented at a conference in November 1967 (36pp., 9" x 6", February 1968) Price: 8/6

No. 4 - "Research into Higher Education 1967" - papers presented at the Society's Third Annual Conference (52pp., 9" x 6", March 1968) Price: 10/6

The prices quoted are those payable by non-members of the Society and are inclusive of surface postage. Corporate members receive two copies of the Register and Abstracts and one copy of all other publications free of charge; individual members receive the Register and Abstracts and can buy other publications at substantially reduced prices.

Printed by Direct Design, Christchurch, Hants.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION was established in 1967 under the direction of Professor W.R. Niblett. It incorporated the Research Unit on University Teaching Methods set up in July 1965 and the research projects related to higher education previously conducted by the Centre for the Study of Educational Policies. Research will continue to be an essential element in the work of the Department, but it is the intention gradually to increase its teaching activities.

One of the Department's research projects, which is supported by the Joseph Rowntree Memorial Trust, is concerned with student residence. Its main aim is to consider the different purposes for which residence is provided and to examine the functioning of various forms of residential policy in relation to these purposes. The two research officers engaged upon the project are Dr. Joan Brothers and Mr. Stephen Hatch.

This publication is the third monograph arising from the work of the Project. The first, which was published by the Department jointly with the University of London Research Unit for Student Problems was entitled Student Residence : Policies, Provision and Regulations by Jean Brothers and Michael Kendall. The second, also published by the Department was Three Aspects of Student Residence : Recruitment, Participation and Academic Performance by Henry Acland and Stephen Hatch.